

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.weylo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/693,052	10/23/2003	Yi-Chung Chan	320528643US	1566	
25096 PERKINS CO	7590 12/02/200 IE I I P	EXAMINER			
PATENT-SEA			BIBBINS, LATANYA		
P.O. BOX 124 SEATTLE, W			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			2627		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			12/02/2009	ELECTRONIC .	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentprocurement@perkinscoie.com skempe@perkinscoie.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/693,052	CHAN, YI-CHUNG		
Examiner	Art Unit		
LaTanya Bibbins	2627		

	LaTanya Bibbins	2627				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 15 October 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.				
<ol> <li>M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request			
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.					
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In ne overnt, however, will the statutory prior for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b), ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO						
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(	n).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the protoid of extended under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as			
NOTICE OF APPEAL	F Th. 07 OFD 44 07	The state of the state of the state of				
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
	. A series to the state of Class a being					
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t         <ul> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor</li> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause			
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for			
	(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.					
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).						
The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).						
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) <u>39-45</u> would be alk non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		mely filed amendmen	t canceling the			
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)   how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 29-38.		be entered and an e	xplanation of			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>39-48</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.			
The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
Marine Vermal						
/Wayne Young/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2627	/LaTanya Bibbins/ Examiner, Art Unit 2627					

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed specification amendment and drawing correction are not approved, since it raises further consideration under 112, 1st par.

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Regarding claims 46-48, Applicant argues that one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly recognize that processor-readable media were commonly employed in optical delevies and optical disc systems. Applicant supplies evidence that such processor-readable media is used to store data a programs for processors, DSPs and other functional blocks. Applicant concludes that the disclosure conveys to one of skill in the art that applicant was in possession of the "processor-readable medium" of claim 46-49.

Applicants arguments, with respect to claims 46-48 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. While processors and processor-readable mediums may be commonly employed in optical devices and optical disk systems, optical storage medium discrimination is not inherently performed by a processor-readable medium. In addition, a processor-readable medium which specifically stores instructions for discriminating a type of optical storage medium is not disclosed or described in the original specification. As such the written description requriment is violated.